

NOV - 7 2002

DAVID W. PETERSEN

HONORABLE JUDGE JAY B. ROOF

Hearing Date: November 8, 2002

Hearing Time: 1:30 p.m.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR KITSAP COUNTY

CITY OF BREMERTON, a municipal corporation.

Plaintiff.

vs.

WILLIAM J. SESKO and NATACHA SESKO,
husband and wife, and their marital community.

Defendants

Case No.: No. 97-2-01749-3

DECLARATION OF WILLIAM J. SESKO

1. I William J. Sesko, hereby declare under the penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of Washington as follows:

2. I am over the age of 18 years, competent to testify, and make this declaration based on my own knowledge and belief, except where indicated otherwise.

3. My wife Natacha Sesko and I pay over \$23,000 per year property tax to Kitsap County and we should be secure with our possession and treated as others under the law.

4. I designed a Submarine High Pressure Emergency Ballast Blow System after the Thresher sank. The same emergency system the Navy was using when they sank the Japanese research boat near Hawaii. It's for emergency use.

5. The two submarine salvage pontoons off our Pennsylvania Avenue Property in The State Harbor areas are of historic significance. Because they could have been the ones used to salvage the USS SQUAI US in 1939. The City wants to destroy them.

DECLARATION OF WILLIAM J. SESKO.

1 -

6. We rented property west of our Pennsylvania property for storage and research and Development for \$1000 per month.

7. The City ordered the property vacated and denied us an appeal (see Exhibit 1,2,3)

8. The order exhibit 1 clearly states vehicle storage not allowed in Business Park Zone And Boat must be removed; yet exhibit 3 to 14 clearly shows vehicles and stored boats through out Penn Plaza Storage Yard. Only Sisko's boats and vehicles had to be removed!

9. Exhibit 15-19 shows Sisko use of Pennsylvania Avenue property isn't a problem With adjacent properties. Exhibit 16 shows the city trying to create a problem.

10. Appellant review cause No. 23150-6-11 states " The orders for injunctive relief Do not prevent uses for business purposes; they only require the removal of the junk on the sites."

11. We want to make productive use of our properties and need real guidelines. An Opinion printed in the Bremerton November 5,02 exhibit 20 shows our difficulties "Description of the Bremerton Planning Department range from "It is in a continual State of disarray" to " it is a constant swinging door down there" to "you never get the same opinion twice".

12. Exhibit 21. A Memorandum from Don Pratt in February 6,1997 states " I am the City" and he is not confident in his actions against us.

13. The Shoreline Master Program City of Bremerton Page. 7-7. Exhibit 22 shows we Should have been able to appeal Don Pratt's decision upheld by the planning commission to the City Council and then the shorelines hearing board as provided in RCW 90.58.180.

14. Our appeal to City Council was never heard and after a year delay Don Pratt said we

DECLARATION OF WILLIAM J. SESKO.

2-

1 Didn't get a hearing.

2
3 15. And here we are with the City trying to say we can't ever use our Pennsylvania
4 Avenue property productively.

5 16. The Shoreline Master Program Page. 3-12 Exhibit 23. States the Port of Bremerton is
6 Encouraged coordinating Industrial Use along the shoreline.

7
8 17. With the Courts approval may be the port of Bremerton could coordinate our use of
9 our Pennsylvania Avenue property.

10 I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE
11 OF WASHINGTON THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

12 Dated this 6th day of November 2002. At Bremerton Washington.

13
14
15 

16 WILLIAM J. SESKO
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DECLARATION OF WILLIAM J. SESKO.

3 -

NOV-07-02 THU 04:23 PM

6924232

P.02